NEAL & HARWELL, PLC

LAW OFFICES

150 FOURTH AVENUE, NORTH SUITE 2000

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37219-2498

TELEPHONE (615) 244-1713

FACSIMILE (615) 726-0573

June 28, 2005

AUBREY B HARWELL. III
W DAVID BRIDGERS
KENDRA'E SAMSON
MARK P CHALOS
DAVID G THOMPSON
CYNTHIA S PARSON
KELTIE/L HAYS
CHRISTOPHER D BOOTH
RUSSELL G ADKINS

RUSSELL G ADKINS ELIZABETH S TIPPING

OF COUNSEL JOHN D CLARKE

Chairman Pat Miller Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, TN 37238

Re:

JAMES F NEAL AUBREY B HARWELL JR

JON D ROSS JAMES F SANDERS THOMAS H DUNDON

HOMAS H DUNDO HONALD G HARRIS ALBERT F MOORE PHILIP N ELBERT JAMES G THOMAS WILLIAM T RAMSEY

JAMES R KELLEY MARC T MCNAMEE GEORGE H CATE, III

PHILIP D IRWIN A SCOTT ROSS GERALD D NEENAN

Post-Status Conference Brief of The Rural Coalition of

Small LECs and Cooperatives

Dear Chairman Miller:

Enclosed for filing is an original and fourteen copies of the Rural Independent Coalition's Post-Status Conference Brief of The Rural Coalition of Small LECs and Cooperatives.

Thank you for your assistance

Sincerely,

William T. Ramsey

Bill Lanney

WTR:smm Enclosure

BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

Land to the same of the same o

2005 JUN 28 PH 3: 35

IN RE:	TRA COCKET ROOM
Petition of Sprint Spectrum L.P. d/b/a Sprint PCS	Consolidated
for Arbitration under the Telecommunications Act)	Docket No. 03-00585
Petition of T-Mobile USA, Inc. for Arbitration under the	(
Telecommunications Act)
Petition of BellSouth Mobility LLC; BellSouth Personal	•
Communications, LLC; Chattanooga MSA Limited Partnership;	
Collectively d/b/a Cingular Wireless, for Arbitration	
under the Telecommunications Act	
Petition of Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless for	
Arbitration under the Telecommunications Act)
Petition of AT&T Wireless PCS, LLC d/b/a AT&T Wireless for)

POST-STATUS CONFERENCE BRIEF OF THE RURAL COALITION OF SMALL LECs AND COOPERATIVES on behalf of

Arbitration under the Telecommunications Act

Ardmore Telephone Company, Inc. Ben Lomand Rural Telephone Cooperative, Inc. Bledsoe Telephone Cooperative CenturyTel of Adamsville, Inc. CenturyTel of Claiborne, Inc. CenturyTel of Ooltewah-Collegedale, Inc. Concord Telephone Exchange, Inc. Crockett Telephone Company, Inc. Dekalb Telephone Cooperative, Inc. Highland Telephone Cooperative, Inc. Humphreys County Telephone Company Loretto Telephone Company, Inc. Millington Telephone Company North Central Telephone Cooperative, Inc. Peoples Telephone Company Tellico Telephone Company, Inc. Tennessee Telephone Company Twin Lakes Telephone Cooperative Corporation United Telephone Company West Tennessee Telephone Company, Inc. Yorkville Telephone Cooperative

)

DIDE

The Rural Coalition of Small Local Exchange Carriers and Cooperatives (hereafter referred to as the "Coalition" or the "Independents") respectfully submits this Post-Status Conference Brief. At the Status Conference held in this proceeding on June 14, 2005, Chairman Miller requested that the parties submit briefs regarding the applicability of Section 51.711 of the Rules and Regulations of Federal Communications Commission ("FCC"). Chairman Miller also requested the parties to submit statements on whether the Authority could order a uniform reciprocal rate for all Coalition members.

This matter arose in the context of the general purpose of the Status Conference which was "scheduled for the purpose of discussing the process the Authority should undertake to determine a permanent rate for reciprocal compensation." The Coalition respectfully offers the following observations and analysis regarding Section 51.711 of the FCC Rules.

Section 51.711 is entitled "Symmetrical reciprocal compensation." The rule generally requires that "(r)ates for transport and termination of telecommunications traffic shall be symmetrical." When interconnection is established between an incumbent local exchange carrier (LEC) and a carrier that is not an incumbent LEC, the general rule provides that "symmetrical rates are rates that a carrier other than an incumbent LEC assesses upon an incumbent LEC for transport and termination of telecommunications traffic equal to those that the incumbent LEC assesses upon the other carrier for the same services." In other words, the general rule provides that the carrier that is not an incumbent LEC charges the same termination rate to the incumbent LEC as the incumbent LEC charges, thereby establishing symmetrical rates.

⁴⁷ CFR Sec. 51 711

² Corrected Notice of Status Conference in Docket 03-00585 issued May 27, 2005.

³ 47 CFR Sec 51 711(a)

⁴ Id at 51 711(a)(1).

Similarly, with respect to the assessment of tandem switching charges, the general FCC rules provides "Where the switch of a carrier other than an incumbent LEC serves a geographic area comparable to the area served by the incumbent LEC's tandem switch, the appropriate rate for the carrier other than an incumbent LEC is the incumbent LEC's tandem interconnection rate." Again, the result of the general rule is symmetrical rates.

The general FCC rule establishing symmetrical rates also sets forth two provisions for exceptions to the general rule. The first exception provides an opportunity for the carrier other than the incumbent LEC to seek an asymmetrical rate by proving "to the state commission on the basis of a cost study using the forward-looking economic cost based pricing methodology described in §§51.505 and 51.511, that the forward-looking costs for a network efficiently configured and operated by the carrier . . . exceed the costs incurred by the incumbent LEC . . . and, consequently, that such that a higher rate is justified." In this proceeding, no CMRS provider has suggested that higher asymmetrical rates to terminate traffic on CMRS networks are appropriate.

The general FCC Rule establishing symmetrical reciprocal compensation rates has one other provision that applies to specific classes of wireless carriers, paging service providers. This second exception provides that a state regulatory authority commission will establish the rates that paging carriers assess upon other carriers for the transport and termination of telecommunications traffic based on the forward-looking costs that the paging carriers incur in providing such services."

⁵ Id at 51 711(a)(3)

⁶ Id at 51 711(b)

⁷ Id at 51 711(c)

The Coalition is not aware of any state or federal proceeding where the provisions of Section 51.711(c) have been applied. Nor, is the Coalition aware of any proceeding to establish terms and conditions of interconnection where the issue of symmetrical rates was addressed. It is not surprising that it may not have been necessary for any other state regulatory authority to consider the reasonableness of symmetrical rates between incumbent rural local exchange carriers and CMRS providers. As the Authority is aware from prior discussions and pleadings in this proceeding, the Coalition has noted that in several other States in this region, the CMRS providers and rural incumbent local exchange carriers have reached mutually agreed upon terms and conditions with respect to their interconnection rights and obligations.⁸

Finally, as stated by counsel for the Coalition at the July 14, 2005 Status Conference, the Coalition agrees that, absent an agreement among the parties, separate reciprocal rates must be established for each individual Coalition member.

The Coalition members remain ready and willing to negotiate mutually agreeable terms and conditions in Tennessee Unfortunately, the Coalition submits that the CMRS providers do not have the same willingness to reach mutually agreeable rate terms in Tennessee similar to those reached in other States (within a range of 1 7 to 2.5 cents per minute) because of a sense of strength the CMRS providers apparently perceive based on the Authority's January 12, 2005 deliberations in this proceeding. The Coalition respectfully looks forward to the issuance of the Authority's decisions in both this proceeding and in Docket 00-000523, and the associated lawful opportunity to address further the matters discussed by the Authority at its last deliberations in these proceedings

Respectfully submitted,

The Tennessee Rural Independent Coalition

By William O Ranny

William T. Ramsey Neal & Harwell, PLC 2000 First Union Tower 150 Fourth Avenue North Nashville, Tennessee 37219-2498

Stephen G. Kraskin Kraskin, Moorman & Cosson LLC 2120 L St. N W Suite 520 Washington, D.C. 20037

June 28, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that on June 28, 2005, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served on the parties of record via electronic mail, unless otherwise indicated:

Russ Mitten, Esq.
Citizens Communications
3 High Ridge Park
Stamford, Connecticut 06905
Rmitten@czn.com

Henry Walker, Esq. Boult, Cummings, et al. PO Box 198062 Nashville, TN 37219-8062 hwalker@bccb.com

James Wright, Esq.
Sprint
14111 Capitol Blvd.
NCWKFR0313
Wake Forest, North Carolina 27587
James.wright@mail.sprint.com

J. Gray Sasser, Esq.
Miller & Martin
1200 One Nashville Place
150 Fourth Avenue North
Nashville, TN 37219
gsasser@millermartin.com

David Eppsteiner, Esq.
AT&T
1230 Peachtree St., N.E. Ste. 4W26
Atlanta, GA 30309
eppsteiner@att.com

Laura Gallagher, Esq.
Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP
1500 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
laura.Gallagher@dbr.com

Donald L. Scholes Branstetter, Kilgore, et al. 227 Second Ave. N. Nashville, TN 37219 dscholes@branstetterlaw.com

Timothy Phillips, Esq.
Office of the Tennessee Attorney General
PO Box 20207
Nashville, TN 37202
Timothy.Phillips@state tn.us

Guy M. Hicks, Esq.
Joelle Phillips, Esq.
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
333 Commerce St., Suite 2101
Nashville, TN 37201-3300
Joelle Phillips@bellsouth.com

Carolyn.Hanesworth@BELLSOUTH.com

John T. Scott, Esq.
Charon Phillips, Esq.
Verizon Wireless
1300 I Street N.W.
Suite 400 West
Washington, D.C. 20005
elaine critides@verizonwireless.com

VIA U.S. MAIL: Paul Walters, Jr, Esq. 15 East 1st Street Edmond, OK 73034

Elaine Critides, Esq.

Suzanne Toller, Esq.
Davis Wright Temaine
One Embarcadero Center #600
San Francisco, Calif. 94111-3611
suzannetoller@dwt.com

VIA U.S. MAIL:

Beth K. Fujimoto, Esq. AT&T Wireless Services, Inc 7277 164th Ave., N.E. Redmond, WA 90852

Monica M. Barone, Esq. Sprint 6450 Sprint Parkway Overland Park, KS 66251 mbaron02@sprintspectrum.com

Mr. Tom Sams Cleartalk 1600 Ute Ave. Grand Junction, CO 81501 toms@cleartalk.net

Dan Menser, Esq.
Marın Fettman, Esq.
c/o T Mobile USA, Inc.
12920 SE 38th St.
Bellevue, WA 98006
dan.menser@t-mobile.com

Mark J. Ashby Cingular Wireless 5565 Glennridge Connector Suite 1700 Atlanta, GA 30342 Mark.ashby@cingular.com

Stephen G. Kraskin, Esq.
Thomas J. Moorman
Kraskin, Moorman & Cosson LLC
2120 L Street NW, Suite 520
Washington, DC 20037
skraskin@klctelc.com
Timoorman@klctele.com

Mark Felton
SPRINT
6450 Sprint Parkway
Mail Stop KSOPHN0212 – 2A472
Overland Park, KS 66251
mark.g felton@mail.sprint.com

Joe Chiarelli Sprint 6450 Sprint Parkway, 2nd Fl. Mail Stop KSOPHN0212 2A568 Overland Park, KS 66251 jchiar01@sprintspectrum com

Bill Brown
Senior Interconnection Manager
Cingular Wireless
5565 Glenridge Connector, Suite 1534D
Atlanta, GA 30342
bill.brown@cingular.com

Greg Tedesco T-Mobile USA, Inc. 2380 Bisso Lane, Suite 256 Concord, CA 94520-4821 greg.tedesco@t-mobile.com

Gary Sanchez, Associate Director-State Regulatory Relations Cingular Wireless 5565 Glenridge Connector Ste. 1710 Atlanta, GA 30342 gary.sanchez@cingular.com

Marc Sterling
Verizon Wireless
One Verizon Place
Alpharetta, GA 30004
Marc.Sterling@VerizonWireless.com

VIA HAND DELIVERY:

Melvin J. Malone
Mıller & Martin PLLC
1200 One Nashville Place
150 Fourth Avenue North
Nashville, TN 37219
mmalone@millermartin.com

William J. Ranney